

(NeXT Tip #49) Symbols as Array Indexes

Christopher Lane (*lane[at]CAMIS.Stanford.EDU*)
Fri, 25 Feb 1994 14:30:22 -0800 (PST)

(Another of those annoying C programming style tips.)

Looking through application source code on /LocalDeveloper/Examples (which we import from outside -- all around the Internet), I noticed a high incidence of the use of numbers, rather than symbols, as array indexes.

Some examples:

```
textBuf = &cursor[10];
sscanf(&s[7], " %d", &i);
mx[7] = -sin(theta) * cos(phi);
static int scrambledSize3[NUMOFCHALLENGES][9];
if(s[13] == elinfo[j].name[0] && elinfo[j].name[1] == ' ') break;
char host[MAX_VPATH], location[MAX_VPATH], filename[MAX_VPATH], mode[11];
while((dst[-1] == '\n') && (dst[-2] == '>') && (dst[-3] == '\n')) dst -= 2;
```

(The last example is particularly interesting and only make sense when you consider that arrays and pointers are interchangeable in 'C'.) Although 's[13]' may have had an obvious meaning at the time, as you and others look at the code later, this can make it difficult to decipher and fix problems.

I did a simple search to measure how often numbers were used to index (or size) arrays in the *.m (but not *.h) files in the Examples directory -- I've only included counts for more than 1 occurrence and a '*' ~ ten occurrences:

```
[ -1] 12 *
[ 0] 1264 ***** ... ***
[ 1] 603 *****
[ 2] 496 *****
[ 3] 199 *****
[ 4] 91 *****
[ 5] 96 *****
[ 6] 55 *****
[ 7] 34 ***
[ 8] 28 ***
[ 9] 19 **
[10] 39 ***
[11] 8 *
[12] 10 *
[13] 10 *
[14] 10 *
[15] 15 **
[16] 24 **
```

The curve seems reasonable; you'd expect lots of 'x[0]' and 'y[1]' indexes and 'a = z[3]' is used often to define (non-NeXT) bounding regions. (The curve takes longer to trail off to zero than I would have guessed.) There are some (not too surprising) minor spikes at '[10]' and '[16]'.

How can you avoid using numbers as indexes into an array of heterogeneous elements? One traditional way is to #define symbolic indexes:

```
#define iJulianDate 0
#define iUniversalTime 1
...
#define iNextNewMoon 14
#define iNextLunation 15
```

Another way to do this is with enumeration:

```
typedef enum {NRG_NMOD, NRG_HBOND, NRG_NONB, NRG_ELST} MTypes;
```

Then use 'x = array[NRG_NONB]'. Particularly if you don't care about order and you want to be able to easily, arbitrarily add elements. (You can anchor enum elements to numbers if needed by doing 'NRG_HBOND=4,' etc.) Of course,

it's easy to concoct symbols that are less mnemonic than small integers!

Another enum example is one I've described earlier regarding argc & argv:

```
typedef enum {PROGRAM, MODE, FILENAME, SEGMENT, SECTION, ARGC} ARGUMENTS;
```

This is only useful for fixed position arguments (no options) and allows you to do a test like '(argc == ARGC)' to see if all the arguments have been supplied and access 'argv[SEGMENT]' rather than the traditional 'argv[3]'.

One place you can avoid constants in array sizing is:

```
char *types[4] = {"graph", "palette", "bundle", NULL};
```

Where you walk the array checking for set inclusion and use NULL to signal the last element. The compiler is reasonably cooperative and lets you simply do:

```
char *types[] = {"graph", "palette", "bundle", NULL};
```

Which is easier to update without introducing inconsistency.

The symbolic index issue is a special case of my personal programming rule of thumb that numbers greater than +/- 2 in the body of a program are suspect and should be rethought and #define'd or eliminated in some other fashion.

- Christopher 'ColorScroller.m':#define M(x) (170.-.3*(170-x.))/256.'